

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 25, 2010, and the Advisory Action dated October 20, 2010, have been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-26, 28-29 and 31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 31 are amended, and claims 13, 27 and 30 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the Specification at, for example, page 1, lines 19-22; page 2, lines 19-22; page 8, lines 29-30; page 10, lines 7-11 and page 15, lines 2-4. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 5, 7, 13-14, 16-19 and 21-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borkovsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,440,941) in view of Rogson (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010726); claims 3-4, 9, 15 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borkovsky in view of Rogson and Toner et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0024760); claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borkovsky in view of Rogson and Bellany et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0078024); and claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Borkovsky in view of Rogson and Murakami et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0181759). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, the current application claims a method of checking input customer information against existing information, the method comprising tolerating writing

variations in input data by determining in an input customer data record a value of a data field, the data field representing an identifier, determining from a reference data set of predetermined identifier values at least one synonym candidate for the value of the data field using a candidate selection criterion, determining if a synonym candidate of the determined at least one synonym candidate and the value of the data field fulfill a predetermined synonym acceptance criterion based on at least one quality parameter, wherein said at least one quality parameter takes into account writing variations that are evaluated based on differences in the value of the data field and the synonym candidate, and when the predetermined synonym acceptance criterion is fulfilled, associating the value of the data field and the synonym candidate as synonyms and automatically updating a synonym set representing known writing variations for the identifier in a computer readable database and referencing to respective entries in the reference data set by adding the value of the data field to the synonym set as a member referring to the accepted synonym candidate in the reference data set without intervention of a user before searching for a counterpart for the input customer data record, and checking the input customer data record by searching for the counterpart for the input customer data record in the reference data set by comparing the value of the data field to the updated synonym set in the computer readable database after the step of determining if the predetermined synonym acceptance criterion is fulfilled, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 21, 24-26, 28-29 and 31.

Borkovsky teaches a method and apparatus for suggesting an alternative spelling for a search query (Abstract). Borkovsky teaches internet searching, where a

user can enter one or more search query terms and obtain a list of resources that contain subject matter that matches the search query terms (Col. 1, lines 25-31). Borkovsky further teaches that the alternative spelling may be spelled similarly to the original query, or from among a set of candidate alternative spellings (Col. 4, lines 4-11), teaches determining whether to present alternative spelling to a user based on a set of one or more rules that “weigh the frequency of occurrences of files that contain the particular spelling against the frequency of occurrences of files that contain the alternative spelling” (Col. 6, lines 36-40), and provides an example of how the misspelled word “Lincon” is corrected to “Lincoln” (Col. 11, lines 56-67) based on a frequency of appearance of the correct word. Accordingly, Borkovsky fails to teach a first step of determining at least one synonym candidate for the value of the data field from a reference data set of predetermined identifiers using a candidate selection criterion, and a second step of determining if a synonym candidate of the determined at least one synonym candidate and the value of the data field fulfill a predetermined synonym acceptance criterion based on at least one quality parameter, as recited in independent claims 1, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 31.

Rogson teaches that if a written word is not in the static update list and the user corrects the misspelling, the misspelled word and the correction are both captured in a list (Abstract), and performs a dynamic update 535 that determines whether a user corrects a misspelling and counts the number of times the user has made the mistake and has corrected it (paragraph [0026]). Any further correction in Rogson is performed on the same static updated list. Accordingly, there is no first step of determining at least one synonym candidate for the value of the data field from a reference data set of

predetermined identifiers using a candidate selection criterion, and a second step of determining if a synonym candidate of the determined at least one synonym candidate and the value of the data field fulfill a predetermined synonym acceptance criterion, as recited in independent claims 1, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 31.

Because Borkovsky and Rogson fail to teach the above-discussed features of the amended claims, the applied references do not ensure that synonym candidates are selected based on a rough first criterion from an existing record, and do not use a second criterion such as the claimed synonym acceptance criterion to find the acceptable candidate to a misspelled word. The applied references do not teach that the counterpart search for the input customer data record is done by comparing a value of a data field of the input data to the updated synonym set only after the steps of determining that the data field and a synonym candidate thereof fulfill a predetermined synonym acceptance criterion and updating the synonym set accordingly. In addition, neither Borkovsky nor Rogson teach checking input customer data record by searching for the counterpart for the input customer data record in the reference data set, as recited in the independent claims.

In the Advisory Action, the Patent Office states that “[i]t is quite inherent that later searches with any (different or identical) input query would then also be compared with the newly updated dictionary file.” However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Borkovsky or in Rogson that an updated synonym set is used for checking the same input data record based on which the update was performed in the first place.

For at least a combination of the above reasons, a combination of Borkovsky and Rogson fails to arrive at the subject matter of independent claims 1, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28,

29 and 31. In addition, Toner, Bellany and Murakami, alone or in combination, fail to cure the deficiencies in Rogson and Borkovsky in disclosing or rendering obvious the above-discussed features of independent claims 1, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 31. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 21, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 31 are patentable over all the applied references. Claims 2-5, 7-12, 14-20 and 22-23, at least for their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 21, are thus also patentable. Accordingly, all the pending claims are patentable, and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If for any reason the Examiner feels the application is not in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that he contact the undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case. In the event that any fees are due with respect to this paper, please charge Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Atty. Docket No. 108800.00007.

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration No.: 55,478

Customer No. 04372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 857-6395
Email: DCIPDocket@arentfox.com

GEO:TMN